REMARKS

Applicant hereby requests further consideration of the application in view of the amendments above and the comments that follow.

Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for the telephone interview with Applicant's attorney, Laura Kelley, on January 19, 2007. In particular, Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for suggesting revisions and making comments on various proposed claim amendments. Although agreement was not reached, the Examiner agreed to consider the above amendments. The issues discussed with the Examiner are summarized herein, and additional reasons in support of patentability are provided. This Response shall constitute an Interview Summary to the extent that one is required under MPEP § 713.04.

I.   Status of the Claims

Claims 13 and 14 stand rejected under 35 USC § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claims 1-10 and 12-16 stand rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Number 6,031,904 An et al ("An"). Claims 11 stance rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over and in view of U.S. Patent Number 6,961,415 to Doherty et al. ("Doherty").

The rejections under Sections 101, 102, and 103 will now be addressed.

II.   Section 101 Rejections

Although Applicant submits that Claims 13 and 14 satisfy the requirements of Section 101 as originally filed, Applicant appreciates the Examiner's suggestion to amend Claim 13 to recite "computer-usable storage medium" to overcome the rejection. In order to expedite prosecution, Claim 13 has been amended as suggested by the Examiner. This is not a substantive amendment and does not affect the scope of the claims.

In view of the above amendments, Applicant requests that the rejection under Section 101 be withdrawn.

Section 102/103 Rejections

Claim 1 recites a method of correcting an error in a service order. The service order includes an electronic document having a plurality of fields, and the plurality of fields have data associated therewith. The method includes:

> providing a service order control panel, the service order control panel comprising a plurality of function controls, each function control having an associated predetermined function that manipulates data in at least one of the plurality of fields in the service order;
> detecting an error in the service order, wherein said detecting is performed by a service provider;
> accepting user input from a user to select a function control, wherein the user input is provided by a service provider; and
> performing the predetermined function associated with the selected function control to manipulate data to correct the error in at least one of the plurality of fields in the service order.

Applicant submits that at least the above underlined portions of Claim 1 are not taught or suggested by An.

An proposes allowing telephone subscribers to update features that are active on a telephone over the Internet. See An, abstract. In contrast, embodiments according to the current invention are directed to correcting an error in a service order where the error is detected by a service provider. For example, as discussed on page 8, lines 1-6 in the current application, service orders with irregularities or errors requiring attention can be identified using software code that identifies an error in the data from the service orders. An error code or identifier can be assigned to the service order so that an operator knows why the service order has an error. User input (provided by the service provider) can be accepted to select a function control, and the selected function can be performed to correct the error. In some embodiments, the number of keystrokes necessary to correct errors in the service order can be reduced, and errors may be corrected in less time than it reduced expense to the service provider. See specification page 5, lines 3-15.

In addition, An teaches away from a service provider detecting the error and/or providing input to select a function control. The telephone subscribers in An can configure

various services and features which are active on their telephone lines <u>without the need for</u> <u>involvement of a service representative</u>. See An, column 4, lines 12-15. For example, An discusses that a person arriving at a new location could use the interface of An via a hotel or friend's Internet access to activate his/her "call forward" feature with a number of the telephone in the hotel or friend's home without needing a human interface and thus reducing operating costs to telephone service providers. See An, column 1, lines 42-53. The disclosure of An also does not appear to be concerned with detecting or correcting errors in a service order.

Accordingly, An does not teach or suggest at least detecting an error by a service provider and/or that the user input is provided by the service provider as recited in Claim 1. Independent Claims 13 and 15 recites analogous features to those recited in Claim 1, and are likewise patentable for the reasons discussed with respect to Claim 1. Claims 2-12, 14 and 16 are patent emboldened least per the patentability of the claims from which they depend.

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, Applicant submits that the present application is in condition for allowance and the same is earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner have any small matters outstanding of resolution, he is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at 919-854-1400 for expeditious handling.

Respectfully submitted,

Laura M. Kelley
Registration No.: 48,441

USPTO Customer No. 39072
Myers Bigel Sibley & Sajovec
Post Office Box 37428
Raleigh, North Carolina 27627
Telephone: 919/854-1400
Facsimile: 919/854-1401

Attorney Docket No. 9400-32
Application Serial No. 10/624,160
Filed: July 21, 2003
Page 9